

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

MAY 30 2008

**Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts**

Lloyd Bell,

Plaintiff,

v.

Dr. Jill R. Grant,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.

08 0932

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain “ (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff, a prisoner at the Federal Medical Center in Butner, North Carolina, sues the Staff Psychologist there in her individual capacity for \$2 million. Plaintiff attaches an Order from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana dated March 4, 2008,

authorizing the defendant and other medical personnel at the Butner facility to involuntarily medicate him for the purpose of rendering him competent to stand trial on criminal charges. He accuses defendant of “criminal conspiracy” and “fraud,” Compl. at 7-8, but the complaint allegations are too vague to provide any notice of a claim and the basis of federal court jurisdiction. The Court therefore will dismiss the complaint by separate Order issued contemporaneously with this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

Date: May 28, 2008